Structural Intelligence and Enactivism

A Bridge Between Sense-Making, Presence, and Answerability

Vladisav Jovanović

April 2, 2026

Abstract

This paper argues that enactivism and Structural Intelligence (SI) belong together. Enactivism shows that cognition is embodied, situated, and enacted through an organism's ongoing relation with its world. SI begins from the same terrain but asks a further question: what happens when that relation remains meaningful while becoming less answerable to reality?

A person can still make sense of the world while losing the ability to revise, interrupt, or reorient under pressure. A system can remain adaptive in a local sense while drifting from contradiction, cost, and consequence. This paper argues that SI extends enactivism by giving a clearer language for these cases. It helps describe what happens when sense-making stays active but steering weakens, burden rises, and revision becomes harder.

The result is a bridge between embodied cognition and a more pressure-sensitive account of presence, carrying capacity, loss of steering, collapse, and repair. Enactivism explains how a world of significance is enacted. SI asks whether that enacted world can still hold when reality pushes back.

Intellectual property notice. This manuscript is the intellectual property of the author; please do not reproduce, distribute, or republish it without permission except where applicable licensing terms explicitly allow it.

1 Introduction: Why Enactivism and Structural Intelligence Belong Together

Enactivism remains one of the most important corrections in philosophy of mind and cognitive science. It shifts attention away from the picture of mind as an inner spectator manipulating representations from a distance. Instead, it treats cognition as something lived through embodied activity, organism–environment coupling, autonomy, and sense-making. On this view, cognition belongs to a living being engaged with a world rather than to a detached processing center sealed off inside the skull.

This is already close to the concerns of Structural Intelligence. SI also begins from the fact that life is lived under contact. It asks how a person, system, or institution meets pressure, carries burden, and revises under constraint. But SI adds a further question. What happens when the relation between organism and world becomes strained enough that coherence begins to separate from contact? What happens when sense-making remains active while answerability begins to weaken?

That is the bridge in its simplest form. Enactivism shows that cognition is enacted. SI asks whether what is enacted remains real enough to hold. This paper argues that the two frameworks fit especially well because enactivism gives a powerful account of embodied sense-making, while SI gives a sharper language for pressure, presence, collapse, repair, and burden-bearing. Together they offer a richer picture of cognition: life, body, action, world, and also the question of whether the enacted structure remains answerable when reality pushes back.

2 What Enactivism Sees Clearly

Enactivism begins with a decisive shift. Mind is understood through living activity rather than through detached inner representation. The organism does not first build a full inner copy of the world and then consult it from a distance. It lives, acts, senses, and brings forth a world of significance through embodied engagement.

This is why enactivist writers speak of sense-making. A living being is not simply located inside an environment. It enacts a world that matters to it. What appears as relevant, dangerous, nourishing, attractive, or possible arises through the relation between organism and world. In this way, cognition belongs to life itself rather than to a purely internal theater.

This already brings enactivism close to Structural Intelligence. SI starts from the same fact that life is lived in contact with what pushes back. What SI adds is a sharper account of the world being met. Enactivism often speaks of the environment, and that language is useful. But it can sometimes sound too flat, as if the organism were moving through a neutral background and giving it meaning through activity. SI uses a stronger term: the differentiated field. A differentiated field is never neutral. It already contains asymmetries, gradients, burdens, limits, uneven potentials, and pressures that do not wait for the organism's interpretation in order to exist.

That distinction matters because it changes the picture of cognition. The organism is not merely making sense of a passive space. It is moving through unequal reality. Some affordances open easily. Others carry cost. Some gradients invite stability. Others intensify strain. The field already has shape before the organism's local organization takes hold of it.

So enactivism gives us several powerful insights: cognition is embodied, world-involving, processual, and relational. SI keeps all of that and adds one more demand: the enacted relation must still be measured against the field's actual structure.

3 What Structural Intelligence Adds

Structural Intelligence begins from a distinction between coherence and contact. Coherence is what hangs together. A life can be coherent. A narrative can be coherent. A role can be coherent. A coping style can be coherent. A worldview can be coherent. Coherence matters because it gives shape, continuity, and orientation.

Contact asks more. Contact means answerability to what pushes back: contradiction, cost, consequence, time, refusal, repair, bodily limit, relational friction, and the pressures of reality itself. A structure can therefore be coherent while becoming weakly coupled to contact.

This is SI's central move. It says that intelligence is more than successful organization or effective adaptation. Intelligence includes revision-capacity under constraint. A structure shows intelligence when it can meet pressure, absorb correction, and reorganize without collapsing into denial, theater, punishment, or cost export.

That is the added grammar. Enactivism explains how a world is enacted. SI asks whether that enacted world is load-bearing. Enactivism explains sense-making. SI asks how sense-making behaves when contradiction enters. Enactivism explains embodied coupling. SI asks what happens when coupling remains active while steering weakens, burden rises, and revision becomes more difficult.

In this sense, SI extends enactivism by introducing a clearer language for:

- presence under load,
- somatic capacity,
- loss of steering,
- defended coherence,
- structural debt,
- binding revision,
- collapse and reorganization.

4 Sense-Making and Answerability

One of enactivism's strongest ideas is that living beings enact worlds of significance. A world becomes meaningful through embodied engagement. The organism does not simply register neutral data. It lives in a field of salience, relevance, possibility, and value. This is a powerful account of cognition.

SI keeps that insight and adds a further distinction. A world of significance can be enacted in ways that remain deeply meaningful to the organism and still begin to drift from contact. Sense-making can remain vivid while answerability weakens.

A person can enact a world in which they are always under threat, always overlooked, always morally central, always responsible, always behind, or always on the verge of vindication. Such a world can feel real because it is embodied, repeated, and affectively charged. It can remain internally coherent. It can even guide action effectively for a time. And still, it may be a weakly answerable world.

This is why SI adds an audit question: What is the relation between sense-making and reality-contact here? Meaning by itself does not guarantee correction. A person may enact a deeply meaningful world and still be trapped in a structure that narrows revision. A system may enact a stable field of salience and still survive through cost export. An institution may organize the world successfully for its own continuity while becoming less answerable to the reality it claims to serve.

So SI does not challenge the fact of sense-making. It asks about the structural quality of that sense-making. Is it increasingly reality-coupled? Does it remain revisable? Can it metabolize contradiction? Can it carry consequence? Can it repair? Those are the questions enactivism makes newly possible and SI presses further.

5 Embodiment, Somatic Capacity, and the Limits of Revision

Enactivism gives embodiment a central place. SI deepens that by asking what embodiment can carry. A person does not meet pressure only through concepts. They meet it through the body. Activation, fear, urgency, shame, flooding, collapse, numbness, compulsion, and loss of steering all have somatic reality. This matters because cognition continues through these states even when reflection becomes thinner.

This is why SI uses the term *somatic capacity*. Somatic capacity refers to the biological bandwidth available for metabolizing contact while keeping enough pilot access online. When incoming pressure exceeds that capacity, the system still makes sense of what is happening, but it does so under overload.

This helps explain a familiar experience: a person can understand what is happening and still repeat the same behavior. Insight remains present as language, while revision becomes harder as embodied carrying capacity falls. SI adds a stronger mechanism here: somatic gating. When pressure rises beyond somatic capacity, the issue is more than stress in a general sense. Steering is actively transferred toward substitute controllers. Survival scripts, defensive routines, compulsive loops, and familiar protective organizations begin to take over the work of selecting action. The system narrows around what can preserve local continuity fastest.

This is closely related to pilot severance. Pilot severance names the condition in which supervisory access to steering has thinned out enough that the person continues to act, speak, interpret, and respond, but with far less ability to interrupt, audit, or revise in real time. The enacted world remains alive. The carrying structure has shifted. That is why people so often say, "I knew exactly what was happening, and I still could not stop." The problem is not simply weak insight. The problem is that the somatic floor has been flooded and the gate layer has transferred control to substitute structures built for continuity rather than revision.

6 Presence as Embodied Contact Under Load

Enactivism already makes a strong case that cognition happens through embodied engagement with the world. SI adds a more exact account of presence.

Presence is not a mood. It is not a spiritual atmosphere. It is the condition in which attention, intention, and action remain sufficiently aligned under pressure. A person can be highly active, highly verbal, even highly insightful, and still have very little presence. What matters is whether the structure remains in contact while load rises.

This is where presence becomes a bridge term. From the enactive side, presence is lived coupling. It is embodied participation in a world that matters. From the SI side, presence is what remains online when pressure rises and the organism still stays answerable to reality.

This gives presence a double depth. It is embodied because it happens through the body's relation to the world. It is structural because it can increase or thin out depending on load, intrusion, defended coherence, and somatic capacity.

This is also why presence can disappear without any loss of verbal sophistication. A person can keep explaining while losing live contact. A system can keep functioning while losing answerability. A psyche can keep making sense while its enacted world becomes increasingly sealed off from correction. So SI adds a question enactivism often leaves implicit: What supports presence as load rises, and what causes presence to thin into coping, repetition, or performance?

7 Pilot Access, Intrusion, and the Loss of Steering

Enactivism speaks very well about embodied engagement, but it says less about how steering becomes occupied inside that engagement. SI helps here.

SI uses the image of the *pilot* to name metacontrol access: the capacity to interrupt loops, reallocate attention, and choose under pressure. Pilot access does not sit outside embodiment. It operates through the embodied system itself, which is why it can weaken as load rises.

SI also uses the term *intrusion* for a competing control-loop that begins to occupy steering. Occupancy refers to how much share of attention and action selection that loop takes over. This becomes especially useful when contrasted with enactivism's emphasis on the sensorimotor loop. The sensorimotor loop names the ongoing cycle of action and perception through which an organism remains coupled to its world. That loop can function very well while another layer of governance has already narrowed dramatically.

A person can still catch the ball, argue the point, drive the car, perform the role, or execute the familiar defensive routine. The sensorimotor loop remains intact. The organism remains embodied and coupled. And yet the capacity to step back, audit the action, and revise the governing pattern may be almost absent.

This is where SI introduces the idea of the *sovereign loop*. The sovereign loop is the higher-order capacity through which the system can take relation to its own enacted activity. It is the loop of audit, interruption, and revision. It is what allows a person to remain in the middle of action while still retaining enough freedom to ask: What is happening here? What is governing me? Can this be changed?

That distinction matters enormously. A system can maintain a highly effective sensorimotor loop while losing much of its sovereign loop. In everyday terms, a person can remain deeply embodied, highly responsive, and locally successful while having very little pilot access at all. This is one of SI's clearest contributions to enactivism. It shows that embodied coupling does not settle the question of freedom. A world can remain vividly enacted while steering has already become occupied.

8 When Adaptation Hides Drift

Enactivism often highlights adaptive coupling. An organism responds to its environment, preserves itself, and maintains meaningful engagement. SI adds an important caution: adaptation and answerability do not always move together.

A structure can adapt very effectively to a local environment and still drift from reality in a deeper sense. A person can become highly adapted to a family system, workplace, ideological community, or relational pattern that rewards defended coherence. An institution can become highly adaptive to incentives that favor image over truth. A psyche can become highly adaptive to internal conditions organized around fear or avoidance.

This is where SI introduces the problem of drift. Drift appears when representation, habit, or enacted significance begins to outrun answerability. A world remains coherent and action-guiding. Its relation to contact grows thinner.

This is an especially important extension of enactivism because it introduces a needed distinction between successful coupling and load-bearing coupling. A structure can remain viable in a narrow tactical sense and still become more unreal. It can keep working while more and more burden is being hidden, deferred, or moved elsewhere.

So SI adds a harder question to adaptive success: What kind of adaptation is this? What cost is it carrying directly? What cost is being exported? What contradiction can it absorb? What would force revision? That is where the bridge becomes more than a polite comparison. SI adds a real correction. It says that enacted fit with a local world does not settle the question of truth, burden, or reality-contact.

9 Structural Debt, Collapse, Reorganization, and the Invariance Condition

One of SI's strongest contributions is its language for what happens when reality is deferred. Reality does not disappear when it is avoided. If contradiction is postponed, if repair is delayed, if a system survives through patching, or if a psyche maintains coherence by excluding too much, the burden remains. Over time it accumulates. This accumulated burden is what SI calls *structural debt*.

From an enactive point of view, this means that the organism continues to enact a world and maintain itself, but at rising cost. The enacted world may remain coherent and functional. At the same time, the hidden burden grows. The structure asks more and more energy simply to preserve the same local organization.

That rising cost matters because it gives us a way to read collapse. Collapse is what happens when burden exceeds the current structure's carrying capacity. A previous way of holding reaches its limit. The world remains. The burden remains. The old organization no longer carries what it once carried.

This is where enactivism can begin to reach one of its hardest questions. If a person is deeply constituted through their enacted world, what carries survivability when that world collapses? If a role, coping structure, relational pattern, or embodied organization falls apart, what keeps the person from reading the death of the form as the death of the being?

This is where SI adds the idea of the *invariance condition*. The invariance condition names the non-tradable ontological floor that allows a structure to lose form without losing being. It is what allows collapse to become survivable. Without such a floor, the breakdown of the enacted world is experienced as total annihilation. With it, the person can pass through the death of one organization while retaining a deeper continuity that makes reorganization possible.

Reorganization therefore means more than returning to an older equilibrium. It means a new way of holding relation. It means a revised structure that carries burden differently. In enactive language, the organism does not simply return to earlier coupling. It begins to enact a world differently because the previous organization has lost adequacy.

10 The Novelty of the Bridge

The value of this bridge lies in what each framework gives the other.

Enactivism gives SI a clearer grounding in embodied cognition, organism–environment coupling, autonomy, and sense-making. It helps show that contact is not a purely abstract relation to truth but a living embodied participation in a meaningful world.

SI gives enactivism a sharper grammar for pressure, burden, defended coherence, steering loss, collapse, and repair. It also gives enactivism a stronger account of the world being met. The organism does not move through a neutral environment alone. It moves through a differentiated field structured by gradients, asymmetries, and uneven potentials that continue to matter beyond local enactment.

This creates several real gains.

First, it distinguishes sense-making from answerability. Meaningful engagement with a world can continue while structural drift increases.

Second, it distinguishes embodiment from carrying capacity. A person can remain deeply embodied and still exceed somatic capacity under load.

Third, it distinguishes the sensorimotor loop from the sovereign loop. Action and perception can remain tightly coupled while the capacity for audit and revision grows thin.

Fourth, it gives a more exact account of loss of steering. Pilot access, intrusion, somatic gating, and pilot severance clarify how an enacted world can become increasingly narrow or occupied.

Fifth, it distinguishes adaptive coupling from load-bearing coupling. Something can work while becoming more evasive.

Sixth, it gives collapse a stronger structure by introducing the invariance condition. The loss of one enacted world can become survivable because being is anchored more deeply than the temporary form that failed.

That is the novelty. This is not simply SI borrowing enactive language. It is a true extension. It makes the embodied, enacted, sense-making mind more accountable to the questions of pressure, cost, revision, and reality-contact.

11 Implications

This bridge matters in several domains.

In psychotherapy, it helps explain why insight often changes less than expected. A person can understand a pattern and still remain bound by somatic overload, high occupancy, pilot severance, or accumulated structural debt.

In philosophy of mind, it gives enactivism a stronger account of what happens when lived sense-making becomes defended, rigid, or increasingly detached from correction.

In trauma and embodiment work, it helps connect bodily activation to steering loss, pressure thresholds, the gate layer, and the actual carrying capacity of the nervous system.

In social and institutional life, it helps explain how groups and systems can remain adaptive inside local environments while becoming less answerable to the wider differentiated field in which they are embedded.

In collapse and recovery, it gives a clearer account of survivability. A person can lose a world, a role, a coping structure, or a relational organization and still continue, because the collapse of form need not be read as the collapse of being.

In AI, it gives a way to compare embodied cognition with artificial systems that simulate coherence while lacking the same living burden-bearing relation to consequence, somatic gating, and repair.

All of these implications follow from one central insight: a world can be enacted vividly and still need a deeper audit of whether it remains real enough to hold.

12 Conclusion

Enactivism gives one of the strongest modern accounts of mind as embodied, situated, and world-involving. It shows that cognition belongs to living engagement rather than to detached inner representation. It shows that organisms enact worlds of significance through embodied action.

Structural Intelligence builds on that and asks a further question. What happens when the enacted world remains meaningful while answerability begins to thin? What happens when burden rises, somatic capacity narrows, pilot access weakens, the sovereign loop thins, and adaptation starts hiding drift?

This is where SI contributes something new. It gives a clearer language for differentiated fields, pressure, presence, intrusion, collapse, debt, revision, and repair. It asks whether a structure remains load-bearing under contradiction, cost, consequence, and time. It asks whether a way of making sense can still remain answerable when reality pushes back.

The bridge can therefore be stated simply:

> Enactivism explains how a world of significance is embodied and enacted.
> Structural Intelligence asks whether that enacted world remains answerable under pressure.

Or more fully:

> Enactivism shows how living beings bring forth meaningful worlds through embodied coupling. Structural Intelligence shows how those worlds can drift, overload, collapse, or reorganize depending on burden, steering, and answerability to the differentiated field.

That is the real value of the bridge. It keeps the living force of enactivism while giving it a clearer language for collapse, somatic gating, sovereign steering, carrying capacity, invariance, and repair. It brings embodied cognition closer to the question that matters most in SI: What here is actually real enough to hold?

References

[1] Vladisav Jovanović. *Structural Intelligence (SI) Official Hub.* https://structural-intelligence.blogspot.com/2026/02/structural-intelligence-si-off html

[2] Lawrence Shapiro. *Embodied Cognition.* Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/embodied-cognition/

[3] Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. *Enactivism.* https://iep.utm.edu/enactivism/

[4] Shaun Gallagher. *Embodied and Enactive Approaches to Cognition.* Cambridge University Press, 2023. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/embodied-and-enactive-approaches-to-cognition/FFAB4E136E12255CD3139A87ECB2DCAD

[5] D. Meling. *Knowing Groundlessness: An Enactive Approach to a Shift Toward Non-Dual Awareness. Frontiers in Psychology*, 2021. https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697821/full

[6] Vladisav Jovanović. *Structural Intelligence and the AI Era: Why Coherence Is Not Truth and Why Intelligibility Must Become Answerable.* Zenodo, 2026. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18713058

[7] Vladisav Jovanović. *Structural Intelligence Completion: Intrusion, Structural Debt, Anchoring, Somatic Capacity, Exit Architecture, Viscosity, and Frictional Design Under Cheap Coherence.* Zenodo, 2026. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19203567

[8] Vladisav Jovanović. *The Architecture of Structural Intelligence (SI): A Unified Completion of Presence, Debt, and Occupancy Dynamics.* Zenodo, 2026. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19203732

[9] Vladisav Jovanović. *A Mathematical Grammar of Structure: Adequacy, Pilot Severance, and Collapse Survivability.* Zenodo, 2026. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19376148

[10] Vladisav Jovanović. *The Metabolism of Structure: Collapse, Grief, and Reorganization.* Zenodo, 2026. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19332058

[11] Vladisav Jovanović. *The Dynamics of Structuration: Structural Presence, Boundary,*

Scale, and the Stabilization of Relation. Zenodo, 2026.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19367511

[12] Vladisav Jovanović. *Structural Dynamics of Structuration: Presence, Occupancy, Debt, Boundary, and the Stabilization of Relation.* Zenodo, 2026.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19367649